



GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Chandigarh Administration Gazette

Published by Authority

NO. 108]

CHANDIGARH, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 01, 2022 (BHADRA 10, 1944 SAKA)

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT MAGISTRATE, CHANDIGARH

Order under Section 144 of the Cr.P.C.

The 29th August, 2022

No. DM/MA/2022/20778.—Whereas, in pursuance of the order dated: 14.12.2016 issued by Hon'ble National Green Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi, in the matter of Khalid Ashraf & Anr. Vs. U.O.I. & Ors. (O.A. No. 384 of 2016) AND P.E.T.A., India Vs. U.O.I. & Ors. (O.A. no. 442 of 2016), it has been made to appear to me that a large number of people flying the kites, use synthetic/nylon-glass coated thread popularly known as Pakka thread/Dori and Chinese Maanjha/Dori. These Maanjhas/Doris, being made of synthetic material are non-biodegradable and thus cause serious injuries to human beings, birds and are equally disadvantageous & harmful to the wildlife/environment. In some cases, it had also caused death of humans and birds.

And therefore, I, Vinay Pratap Singh, I.A.S., District Magistrate, Chandigarh, am of the opinion that use of above said synthetic/nylon-glass coated thread popularly known as Pakka thread/Dori and Chinese Maanjha/Dori needs to be regulated in the larger public interest and immediate necessary action is necessary to be taken to prevent serious injury or death to human beings & birds along with harm to wildlife & environment, due to above said Pakka thread/Dori and Chinese Maanjha/Dori.

Now therefore, I, Vinay Pratap Singh, I.A.S., District Magistrate, Chandigarh, in exercise of the power vested with me u/s 144 of Cr. P.C., as a measure of emergency and to prevent serious injury or death to human beings & birds and to prevent harm to wildlife & environment, do hereby order that procuring, stocking, sale and use of synthetic/nylon-glass coated thread popularly known as Pakka thread/Dori and Chinese Maanjha/Dori along with other threads coated with glass and/or such other harmful substances for kite flying are banned within the jurisdiction of Chandigarh, for a period of 60 days.

This order shall come into force **from zero hours on 30.08.2022** and shall be effective for a period of sixty days **up to and including 28.10.2022.**

In view of the emergent nature of the order, it is being issued *ex parte* and is addressed to the public in general. Any breach of this order would invite action under section 188 of the Indian Penal Code.

This order shall be promulgated by publication in the local newspapers through the office of the D.P.R., Chandigarh and by affixing on the notice boards in the office of the undersigned as well as in the District Courts, Chandigarh.

Signature Not Verified
Digitally signed by
Jalinder Kumar
Date: 2022.09.01
16:08:57 (IST)
Reason: Published
Location:

Given under my hand & seal on 26-08-2022.

VINAY PRATAP SINGH, I.A.S.,
District Magistrate,
Chandigarh.

(799)

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :
<https://egazette.chd.gov.in>

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

Notification

The 4th August, 2022

No. 13/1/9882-HII(2)-2022/11625.—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. 07/2018 dated 18.07.2022 delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT Chandigarh between :

BASUDEV S/O SHRI BABU LAL, R/O HOUSE NO. 1549, SECTOR 52, CHANDIGARH.
(Workman)

AND

1. DIRECTOR SPORTS DEPARTMENT, UT, HOCKEY STADIUM, SECTOR 42, CHANDIGARH.
2. GOOD HOUSE KEEPING CONTRACTOR, WZ-519, RAJ NAGAR - 1, PALAM COLONY, NEW DELHI THROUGH ITS AUTHORISED SIGNATORY. (Management)

AWARD

1. In the industrial dispute received in this Tribunal / Court under Section 2-A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (*hereinafter in short called 'ID Act'*) filed by the workman, it is submitted that the workman was engaged by management No.1 initially as part time Mali on April, 2005 on DC rate and he was paid wages of ₹ 1,200/- per month and increased up to ₹ 3,600/- per month and he remained as part time workman up to October, 2012 with management No.1. In November, 2012 management No.1 gave the contract of outsourcing to M/s Good House Keeping Contractor and the workman was employed as full time Mali. He was paid wages of ₹ 5,500/-, ₹6,800/- and lastly ₹ 8,369/- per month. He remained in service up to 03.05.2016. The services of the workman were terminated by verbal order with effect from 04.05.2016. He visited the management for re-instatement in service many times but they postponed the matter on one pretext or other. Hence, the demand notice was being filed. Fresh person in place of the workman has been appointed and no principle of 'first come last go' has been adopted by the managements. Hence, the termination is illegal and against the provisions of the ID Act. Junior to the workman has been retained in service whereas the services of the workman has been illegally terminated *vide* verbal order on 04.05.2016 by the managements. The managements have violated the provisions of Section 25-G, 25-H & 25-F of the ID Act and the services of the workman has been terminated without following the above provisions of the ID Act. Before illegally terminating the services of the workman, no notice, charge sheet has ever been served upon him and no inquiry has been conducted against the workman. Hence, the action of terminating the services *vide* verbal order is illegal and against the law. The workman is not gainfully employed anywhere from the date of termination of services on 04.05.2016 till date. The workman visited many times to the managements for his reinstatement of service but all in vain. The managements had adopted wrong procedure to remove old workmen and at their place appointed fresh workmen Shamu, Lalita Parshad, Tulsi, Ram Milan, Pappu, Narinder etc. Malies to deprive old workmen from their legal right. The similar procedure has been adopted in case of the workman. The management has not conducted inquiry or served notice or paid compensation in lieu of notice to the workman, hence, the management has violated the provisions of Section 25-F, 25-G & 25-H of the ID Act. Due to illegal termination order, the family of the workman has badly disturbed financially and mentally. The workman had completed more than 240 days continuously in a year so termination order is illegal. Neither the principal employer i.e. management No.1 is registered with the Labour Department for outsourcing the service nor the contractor-managements and even the subsequent contractor have obtained licence for engaging the outsources labour from the Labour Department, Union Territory Chandigarh, hence, action of termination of services of the workman is illegal and against the provisions of the ID Act and provisions of Abolition of Contract Labour Act. The claimant-workman has filed a demand notice dated 05.09.2017, which was received in the office of Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer, Union Territory Chandigarh and during the conciliation proceedings no amicable settlement took place and ultimately Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer advised the claimant-workman *vide* Memo No.6207 dated 26.12.2017 to proceed, as

deem fit, as per Sub-Section 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Act, 2010. The cause of action has accrued to the workman on 03.05.2016 when the services of the claimant-workman were verbally terminated and thereafter, when the conciliation proceedings were closed by the Assistant Labour Commissioner on 26.12.2017 and intimated to the workman *vide* Memo No. 6207 dated 26.12.2017 regarding closing of conciliation proceedings. The cause of action is still continuing one. No such or similar proceedings is pending before any court of law, except the present one. Prayer is made that the workman may be reinstated into service with continuity in service and full back wages and all other consequential benefits from time to time.

2. On notice, management No.1 appeared through Law Officer and contested the case of the workman by filing written statement on 07.06.2018 wherein preliminary objections are raised on the ground that the present case is not maintainable against respondent-management No.1 as the claimant-workman was engaged by respondent-management No.2. Respondent-management No.1 entered into contract with respondent-management No.2 for providing manpower and respondent-management No. 2 has to engage the workmen. On merits, it is submitted that the fact that the workman was initially engaged on April 2005 as part time Mali on DC rates, by the management No.1 and paid wages of ₹1,200/- per month and increased up to ₹3,600/- per month as Part time Worker up to October 2012 is matter of record. The fact that in November 2012 management No.1 gave the contract of outsourcing to M/s Good Housekeeping Contractor and the workman was employed as Full Time Mali and was paid wages of ₹5,500/- , ₹6,800/- and lastly ₹8,369/- per month and he remained in service up to 13.05.2016 is a matter of record. The workman had stolen some articles on 11.05.2016 at 5:00 P.M. from cricket stadium, Sector 16. The copy of written statement was forwarded by the concerned Manager to the service provider and he was weeded out by the concerned service provider i.e. respondent-management No. 2. It is a matter between the workman and service provider as such the answering respondent-management has no concern with the removal / replacement of the workman. The workman has been removed by respondent-management No. 2. It is the responsibility of the service provider i.e. respondent-management No. 2 to provide the allied staff to respondent-management No. 1. No violation has been made by respondent-management No. 1. Therefore, the question of illegal termination, issue of notice, charge sheet and conducting of inquiry by the answering respondent-management does not arise at all. There is no agreement between the claimant-workman and respondent-management No. 1. Respondent-management No. 2 was allotted the tender by respondent-management No.1 and new staff was engaged by respondent-management No. 2 at his level.

3. Rest of the averments of claim are denied as wrong except para 15, which is replied in formal manner, being matter of record. Prayer is made that the present claim of the claimant-workman may be dismissed with cost.

4. Upon notice, management No.2 appeared through its representative Shri Lokesh Kumar. Despite availing repeated opportunities management No.1 did not file written statement. Thereafter, none appeared on behalf of management No. 2, thus management No. 2 was proceeded against *ex parte* vide order dated 29.04.2019.

5. The workman filed replication to the written statement of management No.1 wherein the contents of written statement are denied as wrong except admitted facts of the claim statement and averments of the claim statement are reiterated. Additional plea is taken in replication that written statement filed by management No.1 is neither verified nor supported by any affidavit, hence, the same cannot be read in defence.

6. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed :—

1. Whether there is no employer-employee relationship between management No.1 and workman ? OPM-1
2. Whether the services of the workman were terminated illegally by the management, if so, to what effect and to what relief he is entitled to, if any ? OPW
3. Relief.

7. In support of his case, the workman Basudev examined himself as AW1 and tendered his affidavit Exhibit 'AWA/1' along with documents i.e. failure report relating to demand notice bearing Memo No.6207 dated 26.12.2017 issued from the Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer, U.T., Chandigarh through workman Basudev Exhibit 'W1'; copy of demand notice dated 05.09.2017 addressed from workman

Basudev to the Director, Sports Department, UT, Hockey Stadium, Sector 42, Chandigarh and to M/s Good Housekeeping Contractor, WZ-519, Raj Nagar - I, Palam Colony, New Delhi through its authorized signatory *vide* Exhibit 'W2' and self attested copy of aadhar card of workman Basudev *vide* Exhibit 'W3'. Besides on 17.08.2021 learned representative for the workman tendered into evidence photocopy of attendance sheet of part time workers for two hours daily during the month of July 2009 (incorporating the name of the workman Basudev at serial No.2) *vide* Mark 'X' and photocopy of employees' state insurance corporation temporary identity certificate issued in the name of the workman Basudev issued by the Proprietor, Good Housekeeping *vide* Mark 'Y' and closed the evidence of the workman.

8. On the other hand, management No.1 examined MW1 Krishan Lal - Senior Judo Coach, Sports Department, Sector 42, Chandigarh Administration who tendered his affidavit Exhibit 'MW1/A' along with documents i.e. authority letter issued in his favour by the Director Sports, Chandigarh Administration *vide* Exhibit 'M1', copy of attendance register for the month of November 2013 of Good Housekeeping, relating to the employees posted in Sports Department, Unit Sports Complex, Sector 42, Chandigarh incorporating the name of the workmen / employees including workman Basudev as Mali *vide* Exhibit 'M2'. During cross-examination of MW1 copy of the letter dated 13.06.2007 relating to the subject of placement of part time worker accompanied with the copy of list of selected part time Sweepers for four hours daily with effect from 14.06.2007 to 10.09.2007; list of selected part time sweeper for two hours daily with effect from 14.06.2007 to 10.09.2007, waiting list of part time Sweeper for two hours daily, list of selected part time attendant for two hours daily with effect from 14.06.2007 to 10.09.2007 along with waiting list, list of selected part time sweeper-cum-Mali for four hours daily with effect from 14.06.2007 to 10.09.2007, list of selected part time Mali for four hours daily with effect from 14.06.2007 to 10.09.2007 (incorporating name of the workman of the workman Basudev at serial No. 5) *vide* Exhibit 'MX'. On 08.07.2022 Law Officer for the management No. 1 closed evidence on behalf of management No.1. On 18.07.2022 the workman closed his rebuttal evidence.

9. I have heard arguments of learned representatives for the parties and perused the judicial file. My issue-wise findings are as below :—

Issue No.1 :

10. Onus to prove this issue is on the management No. 1.

11. Under this issue learned representative for the management argued that initially in April 2005 the workman was engaged as part time Mali by the management No.1 and paid wages on DC rate i.e. ₹ 1,200/- per month and increased up to ₹ 3,600/- per month. The workman remained as part time workman up to October 2012 with the management No. 1. In November, 2012 the management No.1 gave the contract of outsourcing to M/s Good Housekeeping Contractor (herein management No.2). Since November, 2012 the workman has been engaged by the management No.2 and not by the management No. 1. Thus subsequent to October 2012 the workman is not employee of management No.1. Therefore, the workman has no relation with the management No.1 as his services were provided by the management No. 2 to whom contract for providing manpower as awarded by the management No.1.

12. On the other hand, learned representative for the workman argued that the workman was engaged by the management No.1 initially as part time Mali on April 2005 on DC rates and the workman remained part time Mali with the management No.1 up to October 2012. In November, 2012 the management No.1 gave the contract of outsourcing to M/s Good Housekeeping Contractor and the workman was employed as full time Mali and was paid wages of ₹ 5,500/-, ₹ 6,800/- and lastly ₹ 8,369/- per month. The workman remained in service up to 03.05.2016. Neither principal employer i.e. management No.1 is registered with the Labour Department for outsourcing the service nor the contractor management and even the subsequent contractors had obtained licence for engaging the outsource labour from the Labour Department, U.T. Chandigarh. During evidence the management No.1 did not prove its registration under Section 7 of the Contract Labour (Regulation & Abolition) Act, 1970 and the management No.1 also did not prove that the contractor i.e. management No. 2 has obtained licence under Section 12 of the Contract Labour (Regulation & Abolition) Act, 1970. Therefore, the persons employed by the principal employer through contractor would become the employees of the principal employer. In this manner, the workman is employee of principal employer i.e. management No.1.

13. In the present case, during course of arguments management No.1 has alleged that it is registered under Section 7 of the Contract Labour (Regulation & Abolition) Act, 1970 and the management No. 2 has also obtained licence under Section 12 of the Contract Labour (Regulation & Abolition) Act, 1970 but no such registration certificate or licence is proved into evidence. Even if the principal employer (herein management No.1) is not registered under Section 7 and the contractor (herein management No. 2) has not obtained licence under Section 12 of the Contract Labour (Regulation & Abolition) Act, 1970 in that situation also the persons employed by the principal employer through contractor would not become employees of principal employer. At the most the principal employer and the contractor are only liable for prosecution for violation of Section 7 and 12 of the Contract Labour (Regulation & Abolition) Act, 1970. The law laid down by *Hon'ble Apex Court in Civil Appeal No.2355 of 1991 decided on 22.11.1991 in a case titled as Dina Nath Versus National Fertilizers Limited* referred by learned representative for the management No.1 is applicable to the facts of the present case to an extent. The workman failed to controvert the fact that since November 2012 he is engaged as full time Mali by the outsourcing contractor M/s Good Housekeeping (herein management No.2). Therefore, there is no relationship of employer-employee between management No.1 and workman.

14. Accordingly, this issue is decided in favour of the management No. 1 and against the workman.

Issue No.2 :

15. Onus to prove this issue is on the workman.

16. Under this issue, the workman Basudev examined himself as AW1 and vide his affidavit Exhibit 'AWA/1' deposed the averments of claim in toto. AW1 supported his oral version with documents Exhibit 'W1' to 'W3'. For further corroboration learned representative for the workman referred documents Mark 'X' and Mark 'Y'.

17. It is argued by learned representative for the workman that the services of the workman were illegally terminated by verbal orders with effect from 04.05.2016 without serving any notice or charge sheet and without conducting any inquiry. Wrong procedure has been adopted by the management to remove the old workman and at their place fresh workmen namely Shamu, Lalita Parshad, Tulsi, Ram Milan, Pappu, Narinder etc. are engaged as Malies. On filing of claim, notices were issued to the managements. The management No. 2 appeared and thereafter proceeded against *ex parte*, therefore, the claim of the workman qua management No. 2 has gone un-rebutted and stands proved. Besides the claim statement regarding part time Mali stands proved. On behalf of the workman from the evidence of the workman as well as from the evidence of the management which has brought in evidence document Exhibit 'MX'. In Exhibit 'MX' the name of the workman Basudev was mentioned in the list of selected part time Malies. To support of his plea learned representative for the workman referred the cross-examination of MW1 Krishan Lal wherein he has admitted as correct that the workman was engaged on outsource basis as Mali on outsource from November 2012 till 04.05.2016. MW1 in his cross-examination further stated that the supervision of manpower is done by the Manager, Sports Department. MW1 admitted as correct that the attendance of the workman was marked by the then Incharge Manager / Supervisor of the Sports Department. MW1 stated that he does not know from which period the contract of outsourcing was awarded to M/s Good Housekeeping i.e. management No. 2. He does not know whether the contract with M/s Good Housekeeping remained for seven years. MW1 in his cross-examination admitted as correct that the name of Basudev is shown in documents i.e. the placement of part time worker in the list at serial No. 5, copy of which is Exhibit 'MX' (from Page 1 to 13). MW1 in his cross-examination admitted as correct that as per record the workman was a part time worker from April 2005 to October 2012. He does not know whether any notice was issued to the workman for changing his services from part time to outsource employee with effect from November, 2012 to May 2016. MW1 in his cross-examination stated that he does not know whether Shambo, Lalita Parshad, Tulsi, Ram Milan, Pappu and Narinder etc. appointed as Mali and they are still working. He does not know how many posts of Malies are lying vacant. MW1 denied the suggestions as wrong that the relevant record pertaining to the workman has been withheld intentionally so that his required period as per law may not be completed.

18. On the other hand, management No.1 examined MW1 Krishan Lal, who *vide* his affidavit Exhibit 'MW1/A' deposed all the material contents of the written statement of management No. 1 and supported his oral version with documents Exhibit 'M1' to 'M2'.

19. Learned Law Officer for management No.1 argued that since there is no relation of workman with the management No.1 as the services of the workman were provided by the contractor / management No. 2, therefore, the question of illegal termination, issue of notice, charge sheet and conducting of inquiry by the management No. 1 does not arise at all. The management No. 1 had hired the manpower through outsource agency therefore, question does not arise to appoint Shambo, Lalita Parshad, Tulsi, Ram Milan, Pappu and Narinder etc. as Mali. It is further argued by the Law Officer that the workman had stolen some articles on 11.05.2016 at 5:00 P.M. from cricket stadium, Sector 16, Chandigarh. Copy of complaint was forwarded by the concerned Manager to the service provider and the services of the workman were terminated by the management No.2.

20. As far as the plea taken by the management No.1 that the workman stolen some articles on 11.05.2016 at 5:00 P.M. from the Cricket Stadium, Sector 16, Chandigarh is concerned, the same does not stand proved as no complaint allegedly forwarded by the concerned Manager to the service provider leveling allegation of theft against the workman is proved into evidence.

21. From the oral as well as documentary evidence led by the parties, it comes on record that undisputedly the workman Basudev was initially engaged as part time Mali on DC rates by the management No.1. The workman remained as part time Mali with the management No.1 up to October 2012. Moreover, this fact stands proved from the cross-examination of AW1 Basudev / workman wherein he stated that he joined the Sports Department in April 2005 as Mali. No appointment letter was ever issued by the management No.1.

22. It is own case of the workman as mentioned in para 2 of the demand notice Exhibit 'W2', para 2 of the claim statement and para 2 of his affidavit Exhibit 'AWA/1' that in November, 2012 management No.1 gave the contract of outsourcing to M/s Good House Keeping Contractor and the workman was employed as full time Mali. He was paid wages of ₹ 5,500/-, ₹ 6,800/- and lastly ₹ 8,369/- per month. He remained in service up to 03.05.2016. The services of the workman were terminated on 04.05.2016. The workman is claiming himself employee of the management No.1 on the ground that the management No.1 is not registered under Section 7 of the Contract Labour (Regulation & Abolition) Act, 1970 and the contractor / management No.2 has not obtained licence under Section 12 of the Contract Labour (Regulation & Abolition) Act, 1970 and consequently the workman remains employee of the principal employer i.e. management No.1. As already discussed in issue No.1 the principal employer and the contractor are only liable for prosecution for the violation of Section 7 and 12 of the Contract Labour (Regulation & Abolition) Act, 1970 and the non-registration under Section 7 and non-obtaining licence under Section 12 of the aforesaid act does not create any relationship of employer & employee between the principal employer (herein management No.1) and the workman. Thus, it is duly proved on record that the workman was engaged as outsource employee by the contractor / management No.2 with the principal employer i.e. management No.1 since November 2012, thus, the services of the workman are not terminated by the management No.1. Therefore, the provisions of Sections 25-G, 25-H and 25-F of the ID Act are not attracted in the present case.

23. Much stress has been laid upon the facts by the representative of the workman that MW1 Krishan Lal in his cross-examination has admitted the fact that the attendance of the workman was marked by the then Incharge Manager / Supervisor of the Sports Department. To my opinion, no inference can be drawn from the stray sentence of a witness. The testimony of a witness is to be read in whole. MW1 in his cross-examination stated that it is correct that the attendance of the workman was marked by the then Incharge Manager / Supervisor of Sports Department and he voluntarily stated that attendance was sent to the contractor. MW1 in his cross-examination further admitted as correct that the attendance of the workman from April 2005 till 03.05.2016 was marked by the department and from November 2012 to 03.05.2016 was sent to the contractor. The aforesaid version of MW1 would reveal that the attendance of the workman for the period with effect from November 2012 to 03.05.2016 was marked by the management No.1 and sent to the contractor / management No.2. Moreover, Exhibit 'M2' i.e. attendance sheet for the month of November, 2013 proves

beyond doubt that the contractor Good Housekeeping used to maintain the attendance sheet of outsource employees of Sports Department. The name of the workman Basudev, Mali is mentioned at serial No.5 of attendance sheet marked as Exhibit 'M2'. Furthermore the wage bill of the outsource employee for the month of November 2013 is enclosed with Exhibit 'M2' which incorporates the name of workman Basudev at serial No. 21. The wage bill for November 2013 has been issued by the Good Housekeeping / contractor (herein management No.2) to the Director Sports, Chandigarh Administration (herein management No. 1). This document supports the plea of the management No.1 that the workman was outsource employee engaged through contractor / management No. 2.

24. In view of the aforesaid discussion, since there is no relationship of employer & employee between the management No. 1 and workman therefore the workman in no manner can be said to be terminated by the management No. 1. Consequently, the management No.1 has not violated any provisions of the ID Act. Therefore, the workman is not entitled to reinstatement or any other consequential benefits, claimed by him.

25. Accordingly, this issue is proved against the workman and in favour of management No.1.

Relief :

26. In the light of findings on the issues above, this industrial dispute is declined. Appropriate Government be informed. File be consigned to the record room.

The 18th July, 2022

(Sd.). . .,
(JAGDEEP KAUR VIRK),
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal &
Labour Court,
Union Territory Chandigarh.
UID No. PB0152.

Secretary Labour,
Chandigarh Administration.

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Amit Kumar Chadda, S/o Krishan Kumar, # 2084, Sector 52, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Amit Kumar.

[677-1]

I, Ramesh Prasad Vishwkarma, S/o Ram Sunder, R/o # 1783/A, Small Flats Dhanas, Chandigarh. That I have changed my name from Ramesh Prasad Vishwkarma to Ramesh Kumar.

[678-1]

I, Saanvi Dhiman, D/o Mandeep Singh, # 2806/2, HBS Flats, Sector 49-D, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Baljit Kaur.

[679-1]

I, Anaida, W/o Jamshed Ali Khan, R/o # 3548 Sector 15-D, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Anu Bala.

[680-1]

I, Kiran, D/o Lachhman, W/o Gaurav Kumar, # 546, Sector 38-A, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Kiran Bala.

[681-1]

I, Ravinder Kaur, W/o Satish Shukla, R/o H. No. 921, Sector 40-A, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Ravinder Kaur Shukla.

[682-1]

I, Ramanjit, W/o Sajjan Singh, R/o 536, Mohalla Padhia Wala, Samadhi Gate, Manimajra, Chandigarh, do have changed my name from Ramanjit to Ramanjit Kaur.

[683-1]

I, Jay Bindra *Alias* Jaibindra Singh, S/o Prakash Chand, # 78, Kishangarh, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Jaivinder Singh Yadav.

[684-1]

I, Rajinder Kumar, S/o Pala Ram, # 3815, Maloya Colony, Chandigarh, have changed the name of my minor son from Moksh to Maheer Dulgach.

[685-1]

"No legal responsibility is accepted for the contents of publication of advertisements/public notices in this part of the Chandigarh Administration Gazette. Persons notifying the advertisements/public notices will remain solely responsible for the legal consequences and also for any other misrepresentation etc."